

REMARKS

In paragraph 4 of the Office action of May 31, 2007, there was an objection to paragraph 0005 of the specification. This paragraph has been deleted by the Amendment to the Specification.

In paragraph 5 of the Office action of May 31, 2007, claim 11 was objected to due to a misspelling and this has been corrected as suggested in the Office Action.

In paragraph 7 of the Office action of May 31, 2007, there were several rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

It was said that there was no antecedent for the phrase "two bands" in claim 7, which depended from claim 1. The "two bands" have now been introduced in claim 1 as an antecedent for the recitation in claim 7.

It was said that there was no antecedent for the phrase "the first band" in claim 14, which depended from claim 1. Claim 14 has now been cancelled without prejudice and the two bands have been properly introduced in amended claim 8.

There was an objection to the term "preferably" in claim 16 and this term has been deleted by the Amendment.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10/8, 11/10/8, 12, 13, and 15-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mossbeck et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,357,209.

Mossbeck shows springs which are packed between two webs but the spacing of the webs does not change from the time the webs come together to the time they are wound on the take up roll. This means further that any further compression for the springs is provided prior to reaching the roll and does not change during the winding up.

Amended claim 1 now recites: "wherein the two bands (9, 10) are wound up under tensioning to compress the

objects during the winding."

Amended claim 8 now recites: "the device having a means for tensioning at least the first band (9) between the winding-up reel (1) and the unwinding reel (7) to provide compression of objects between the first band and the second band."

And, amended claim 16 now recites: "a band roll, between the turns of which objects (14) are compressed and secured under tensioning, the objects (14) being narrower than the band roll."

Thus, as seen in Fig. 2 of the present application, the objects 14 are not compressed prior to reaching the wind up roll but are compressed as they are wound up on the roll between the two bands.

Claims 1-4, 7-11 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mueller, U.S. Pat. No. 4,651,941.

Mueller appears to be similar in Figs. 3 and 4 to Mossbeck in that the sheets 2 are not compressed any differently during the wind up than they are prior to the wind up on the roll between the two bands.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10/8 11/10/8 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Magnuson, U.S. Pat. No. 4,213,576.

There do not appear to be two plies or two bands in Magnuson as recited in the claims.

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 10/8 11/10/8 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wooldbridge, U.S. Pat. No. 3,813,843.

There do not appear to be two plies or two bands in Wooldridge as recited in the claims.

CONCLUSION

No fee for extra claims is believed to be due, but if any fee is deemed to be due, please charge Quarles & Brady Deposit Account 17-0055.

In view of the Amendment and Remarks, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. After the amendment, claims 1-2, 6-11, 13 and 15-17 are still pending, and a Notice of Allowance for these claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Michael J. McGovern  
Quarles & Brady LLP  
411 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4497  
(414) 277-5725  
Attorney of Record